

REMARKS**Administrative Overview**

Claims 1-48 were presented for examination. Applicant note with appreciation Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter of claims 2, 12-14, 15-16, 20-21, 25, 35-39, and 43-44. Claims 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as lacking antecedent basis for a limitation in claim 12. Claims 1, 6-11, 17-18, 22-24, 29-34, 40-41, and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,792,607 B1 to Burd et al. ("Burd") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,880 B2 to Marcos et al. ("Marcos"). Claims 3-5, 19, 26-28, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Burd in view of Marcos further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0018648 A1 to Turner et al. ("Turner"). Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 12, and 24. No new matter is added. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-48 are presented for examination.

Applicants note the Examiner's consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on March 4, 2002 and the First Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement submitted on March 31, 2003. Applicants submit herewith a Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement with the present amendment.

Claim rejection of 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 12 is amended to address the Examiner's comment. Claims 13-14 depend on claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 12 overcomes the rejection of claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112 and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim rejection of 1, 6-11, 17-18, 22-24, 29-34, 40-41, and 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 6-11, 17-18, 22-24, 29-34, 40-41, and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Burd in view of Marcos. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to a claim, it is necessary that the prior art references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every limitation of the rejected claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Burd and Marcos, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 24 as amended.

Independent claims 1 and 24, as amended, recite detecting a change in a state of a property mapped to one of said identifiers in the concatenation of identifiers defining the property path, and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the property path due to the change. Burd does not teach or suggest these limitations. Burd discusses the use of control objects to perform postback event handling and postback data handling. In other words, control objects in Burd respond to changes or requests of the user interface elements on the client, and do not detect changes on the data on the server and notify the user interface element on the client. Nor does Burd suggest that the control object may detect changes on the server. Burd teaches that the control objects are terminated or destroyed after responding to requests from the client (See Burd at col. 5 lines 11-16), making it impossible for the control objects to detect changes in a property and update the user interface element due to the change. Therefore, Burd does not teach or suggest the limitations of detecting a change in a state of a property mapped to one of said plurality of concatenated identifiers defining the property path, and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the property path responsive to the detected change.

Nor does Marcos teach or suggest the recited claim limitations of detecting a change in a state of a property mapped to one of said plurality of concatenated identifiers defining the property path, and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the property path responsive to the detected change. Marcos does not teach or suggest the detection of changes in state of any identifiers in a property path and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the path responsive to the detected change. For example, if a property path of “App.PropertyID1.PropertyID3.PropertyID4.PropertyID2” exists, then the invention recited by independent claims 1 and 24 detects a change in the state of any property mapped to any identifiers in the property path, such as PropertyID3. Marcos teaches only direct binding of definitional elements to variables, methods or constants, not detecting a change in a state of a property mapped to one of said plurality of concatenated identifiers defining the property path, and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the property path responsive to the detected change, as recited in independent claims 1 and 24. Therefore, Marcos does not teach or suggest all the limitations in independent claims 1 and 24, as amended.

Accordingly, Burd and Marcos, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element in independent claims 1 and 24. Applicants therefore respectfully request Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of independent claims 1 and 24 and their corresponding dependent claims 6-11, 17-18, 22-23, 29-34, 40-41, and 45-48.

Rejection of claims 3-5, 19, 26-28, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

Claims 3-5, 19, 26-28, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Burd in view of Marcos further in view of Turner. Claims 3-5 and 19 depend from claim 1 and claims 26-28 and 42 depend from claim 24. The arguments made above regarding the failure of Burd and Marcos to teach or suggest all the elements of independent claims 1 and 24 apply with equal force here and are reiterated as if set forth in full.

Turner discloses a design tool for assembling components objects to form an object-based computer system application having a user interface configuration tool for automatically configuring a user interface based on an application design definition modeling an application infrastructure for managing component object interactions.

Turner does not, however, teach or suggest the limitations of detecting a change in a state of a property mapped to one of said plurality of concatenated identifiers defining the property path, and updating the element of the user-interface associated with the property path responsive to the detected change, as recited by independent claims 1 and 24. Turner discloses merely the direct binding of properties to their corresponding component, and does not discuss the use of property paths at all. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Burd, Marcos and Turner, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the elements in independent claims 1 and 24 and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 3-5, 19, 26-28, and 42 which depend from amended independent claims 1 and 24.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicants believe the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this statement. However, if the Director considers a fee due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. CXT-064 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John D. Lanza

Registration No.: 40,060

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP

28 State Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

(617) 227-7400

(617) 742-4214 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant